

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

---

Giovanni Veliz,

Plaintiff,

Civ. No. 07-2376 (RHK/JJK)

**ORDER**

v.

City of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis  
Police Department,

Defendants.

---

For the reasons stated on the record at the October 2, 2008 hearing in this matter,

**IT IS ORDERED** as follows:

1. Plaintiff's Motion in Limine to Exclude Testimony by William McManus Regarding Evidence of Plaintiff's Job Performance (Doc. No. 73) is **GRANTED**;

2. Plaintiff's Motion in Limine to Exclude Evidence of Alleged Misconduct by Lee Edwards (Doc. No. 75) is **DENIED AS MOOT**;

3. Plaintiff's Motion in Limine to Exclude Evidence of Other Applicants' Backgrounds and/or Qualifications (Doc. No. 77) is **DENIED**;

4. The City's Motion in Limine Number 1 (Doc. No. 57) is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**, as follows:

a. Part 1 of the Motion (concerning evidence of the August 2007 meeting at which Lieutenant Arradondo was discussed) is **GRANTED**;

b. Parts 2 and 3 of the Motion (concerning the DEA Liaison position

and the 2005 commendation) are **DENIED AS MOOT**; and

c. Parts 4 and 5 of the Motion (concerning executive training and pre-2005 discrimination) are **DENIED**;<sup>1</sup>

5. The City's Motion in Limine Number 2 (Doc. No. 58) is **DENIED**, subject to redaction of the probable-cause finding;

6. The City's Motion in Limine Number 3 (Doc. No. 59) is **DENIED AS MOOT**; and

7. The City's Motion in Limine Number 4 (Doc. No. 60) is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART** as follows:

a. The Motion is **GRANTED** insofar as it concerns the City's responses to Plaintiff's October 2005 charges of discrimination; and

b. The Motion is **DENIED** insofar as it concerns the City's response to Plaintiff's January 2006 charge of discrimination/retaliation.

Dated: October 6, 2008

s/ Richard H. Kyle  
RICHARD H. KYLE  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> As noted at the hearing, the Court encourages the parties to discuss their willingness to stipulate that Plaintiff filed his discrimination charges in good faith, thereby obviating the need to introduce this evidence at trial.